DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 612 CS 205 692

AUTHOR Miller, M. Mark: Reese, Stephen D.
TITLE Media Dependency as Interaction: The Effects of Exposure and Reliance on Political Efficacy and Activity.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 30p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (63rd, Boston, MA, August 9-13, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Information Seeking: *Information Sources: *Media Research: News Media: *Newspapers: Political Attitudes: *Political Influences: *Political Socialization: Reading Habits: *Television: Television Viewing

ABSTRACT

Media dependency was examined as a complex construct involving the interactions of exposure to television news, exposure to newspapers, and expression of reliance on one medium or the other. A weighted sample of 2,402 respondents was used, representing the United States national population in 1976. A questionnaire assessed each subject's political activity, perceived efficacy of voting/political participation, television exposure, newspaper exposure, media reliance, age, educational level, and family income. Contrary to previous research results, the findings suggested that exposure to television news was not universally detrimental to political affect and behavior. For the majority of the sample who named television as the medium they relied on, television exposure was positively related to perceived political efficacy and to political activity. Television exposure was negatively related to efficacy and activity unless television was the relied upon medium. Newspaper exposure was positively related to the dependent variables except when television was the relied upon medium. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189612

Media Dependency as Interaction: The Effects of Exposure and Reliance on Political Efficacy and Activity

M. Mark Miller and Stephen D. Reese

School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin Madison

[Abstract]

This study examines media dependency as a complex construct involving the interactions of exposure to television news, exposure to newspapers, and expression of reliance on one medium or the other. Contrary to recent claims, the findings suggest that exposure to television news is not universally detrimental to political affect and behavior. For the majority of a national sample who name television as the medium they rely on television exposure is positively related to political efficacy and political activity. Television exposure is negatively related to efficacy and activity unless television is the relied upon medium. Newspaper exposure is positively related to the dependent variables except when television is the relied upon medium.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Mark Miller
Stephen D. Reese

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

For presentation to the Theory and Medology Division. American Association for Education in Journalism, Boston, August 1980.

CS205612

Assertions that attention to news media may harm democratic processes are not new. In a frequently cited paper, Lazarsfeld and Merton (1948) suggested that news media exposure might produce a "narcotizing" effect causing individuals to substitute vicarious participation in politics for actual political activity. Rosenberg (1954) contended that "passive participation and the impersonality of the media may reinforce feelings of futility or apathy as regards the possibility of citizen control-by-election." Lang and Lang (1959) predicted that televised "politics as drama" would result in chronic distrust of political institutions and actors. Recently charges of deleterious media effects have intensified, particularly with regard to television. The charges are exemplified by Manheim's 1976 article, "Can Democracy Survive Television," in which he asserted that increased reliance on television news leads to decreased need and ability to understand politics.

Articles like those cited above could be dismissed as speculation were it not that increases in reliance on television news have coincided with declines in political participation and efficacy (Roper, 1977; Miller, 1974). Further, empirical research has begun to accumulate that is subject to the interpretation that newspaper use is helpful to political processes and television use is harmful.

Even casual observers could conjecture reasons that television news and newspapers might have differential effects. Television is an aural and pictorial medium while newspapers rely primarily on the printed word. Thus, television is better suited to presentation of the dramatic and concrete, and newspapers better suited to detail and abstraction. Reading and watching television require different information processing skills. Newspapers can be read at the individual's convenience and reread if

necessary; television is temporal.

In addition to obvious differences in the formats of newspapers and television news, several studies (summarized by Robinson, 1976, and Becker and Whitney, 1980) have examined the differing "structural imperatives" of the media and their consequent content differences. In general, researchers have concluded: (1) time constraints cause television news to be abbreviated and to minimize background information; (2) the "videocentric" characteristic of television may cause it to focus in the visually interesting rather than the substantively important, (3) to maximize audiences across the socio-economic spectrum, television news highlights dramatic and easily understood news of governmental failure and corruption, and (4) to comply with governmental mandates of fairness, television news is artificially balanced to present both sides of an issue even when the sides are clearly unequal. (It should be noted that most studies of media differences have focused on television without explicit data on newspaper organization and content.)

In addition to seeking explanations for differences in media content, researchers have found differences between newspaper and television news audiences, particularly with regard to information holding. Researchers have consistently reported that individuals who name broadcast media as their primary information source are less informed than those who name print media (e.g., Wade and Schramm, 1969; Patterson and McClure, 1976; Becker and Fruit, 1979; Blumler and McQuail, 1969). Some researchers have gone so far as to suggest that television news impedes political knowledge. Clarke and Fredin (1978) found slight positive correlations and negative partial correlations between ability to give reasons for

their senatorial candidate choices and two indicators of television exposure. This led them to speculate that: "Television may actually exert inhibiting effects on knowing about politics." (p. 150). They also puzzled over "why television should demonstrate a suppressing effect on information." (p. 156) Similarly, Becker and Whitney (1980) found television dependent persons less knowledgeable than newspaper dependent persons. In discussing their findings, they stated: "The differential efficacy of television and newspapers probably contributes to [widening the knowledge gap between the informed and uninformed] persons dependent on television are those low in education who are probably least knowledgeable about public affairs. Their dependency on television only serves to exacerbate this situation." (p. 116)

These assertions of negative effects of television news on knowledge are tenuous on both methodological and theoretical grounds. Both Clarke and Fredin, and Becker and Whitney base their inferences on cross-sectional surveys. This method precludes elimination of third variable explanations and reverse causality. Becker and Whitney do address the latter. Both articles address the issue of third variables (Clarke and Fredin statistically control for education and political interest; Becker and Whitney, for education and age); however, the list of possible cognitive, social, and situational variables that might account for the differences are far from exhausted. Theoretically, it seems implausible that television news somehow removes previously held information from the minds of its viewers. Even the most severe critics of television news have not held that it is devoid of fact or so garbled as to make viewers doubt the factual value of previously held information.

More theoretically tenable are the assertions that reliance on television

causes political inefficacy, distrust and cynicism. In a series of studies, Robinson has reported an association between expressions of reliance on television as a news source and such variables (Robinson, 1975; Robinson, 1976; Robinson and Zukin, 1977; Robinson, 1977). Robinson reasoned that television causes what he called "videomalaise" because it presents a disproportionate amount of "negative" news that is itemized, conflict centered, and image based. It is quite plausible that persons faced with a consistent diet of governmental corruption and ineptness develop distrust and cynicism. Also, persons whose primary news source provides them with abbreviated and image based information might well find politics difficult to understand and, therefore, develop feelings of inefficacy. Although theoretically plausible, Robinsons inferences are based on cross-sectional surveys with the exception of one experimental study (Robinson, 1976).

Miller, Ebring, and Goldenberg (1976) cast doubts on Robinson's measure of reliance -- a single dichotomous item asking which medium is most relied upon. They argue that this is a poor measure of exposure and that if Robinson's reasoning were correct, better measures would reveal more pronounced associations than those reported by Robinson. Using more direct measures of television news exposure Miller et al. failed to replicate Robinson. In fact they report, "the most television exposed were ever so slightly more efficacious than the least exposed." They do, however, extend Robinson's reasoning and report that exposure to newspaper criticism of government is associated with political mistrust. Miller et al. also reported a relatively strong positive relationship between exposure to newspapers and political efficacy.

Also, O'Keefe (1980) found a different pattern of correlations than

Robinson using a different operationalization of reliance ("How much do you count on television/newspapers to help you make up your mind about whom to vote for in the presidential election -- alot, somewhat, or not at all?"). O'Keefe found that this measure of reliance yielded the same pattern of correlations for both television and newspapers. Reliance on both media was positively associated with indicators of political trust and negatively associated with indicators of political inefficacy.

Although empirical investigation of the differential effects of news media is relatively new, a thicket of conceptual and operational definitions already has begun to proliferate. Even the relatively simple concept of media exposure has been variously operationalized as time expended with media, frequency of media use, and ability to recall media information. While all of these approaches are reasonable, there are differences among them that could alter research findings.

Miller et al. accurately interpreted Robinson's theory when they held that the operating mechanism he described for "videomalaise" is exposure. However, their failure to replicate Robinson using exposure instead of reliance mitigates against his reasoning. Construct validity demands that differing operationalizations of the same variable show the same patterns of correlation with other variables. Nonetheless, Robinson reports consistent findings operationalizing reliance as a self-report of the most relied on medium. Thus it appears that self-reports of reliance validly tap some operating mechanism but that this mechanism can be distinguished from exposure. On the other hand, O'Keefe's measure of reliance, which is graded into several levels and is not forced choice, produces a pattern of correlations parallel to exposure.

Precisely what self-report measures of reliance tap is unclear. As a forced choice, the measure does not presuppose any perceived need for political information or exposure to the preferred medium. Individuals could have numerous reasons for preferring television over newspapers, including its relative brevity, more dramatic character, and oral presentation. In fact, it could be preferred simply because the individual is not interested in politics and finds television the easier and more entertaining medium.

Another term, media dependency, is common in the literature of differential media effects. The term was originally used by DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1975) to summarize their observation that as society becomes more complex citizens are forced to depend more on media for vital information. Recently, the term has been altered to indicate differential dependency on alternative media.

Becker and Whitney see media dependency as a complex construct encompassing components of media exposure, relative media exposure, and media preference. Under their approach, to be dependent on a specific medium (television or newspapers) an individual would have to (1) have high exposure to that medium, (2) have low exposure to the alternative medium, and (3) prefer the medium.

This study follows Becker and Whitney's conceptualization of dependency, but departs from their analysis strategy. They combined the components of dependency into an arbitrary index obfuscating the relationships of the components with the dependent variables. We explicitly examine interactions among the components to disentangle their effects.

Hypotheses concerning the interactions of news media exposure and

reliance are based on the assumption that the relied on medium is better suited to the individual's information processing abilities or information needs, or both. If this is true, we would expect individuals to be more affected by exposure to the relied upon medium than by exposure to the non-relied upon medium. Therefore, we hypothesize:

1. The relationship of political affect and behavior with newspaper exposure will be (A) strengthened when newspapers are the relied upon medium, and (B) weakened when television is the relied upon medium.
2. The relationship of political affect and behavior with television exposure will (A) be strengthened when television is the relied upon medium and (B) will be weakened when newspapers are the relied upon medium.

The reliance by exposure interactions hypothesized above are tenable irrespective of the direction of effects of newspaper and television news exposure. However, the direction of effects is an important consideration in hypothesizing television news exposure by newspaper exposure interactions. If it is assumed that television news has a negative relationship with political affect and behavior and newspapers have a positive relationship, then it follows that the relationship of exposure to either medium is stronger when exposure to the other medium is low. While the research by Becker and Robinson supports this assumption, research by Miller et al. and O'Keefe supports the assumption that both media have positive associations with political affect and behavior. If the latter are correct, then it follows that exposure to one medium would strengthen the association between exposure to the other medium and political affect and behavior. Given the conflicting assumptions made plausible by past research, no

hypothesis is offered concerning the interaction of television news and newspaper exposure. Rather this interaction is examined to empirically unravel the direction of effects.

METHODS

Sample

The data used in this study were gathered in 1976 by the Center for Political Studies (CPS) at the University of Michigan. The final weighted sample consisted of 2,402 respondents representative of the U.S. national population in 1976.[1]

Measures

Measures used in this study consisted of questionnaire items selected from the CPS data. Wherever possible, additive indexes composed of several items were used to increase the reliability and validity of the measures. The internal consistency of these indexes was examined to assure that each was positively associated with other index items. The index of internal consistency -- coefficient alpha -- for each index is reported in Table One.

Because this study used data gathered for purposes other than testing the hypotheses offered here, the measures of dependent variables used are not ideal. A key variable in past research -- political knowledge -- was not available in the data set. The SRC data contain many measures of political affect and behavior that were considered. However, we confined our interest to political efficacy and political activity. These variables meet the following criteria: (1) they are generally recognized as being vital to democratic processes, (2) they have been the focus of much of the criticism of television news and of the research cited above, (3) they represent diverse construct domains (efficacy is affective; activity, behavioral), and (4) they were both measured with multiple items allowing

for construction of reasonably reliable indexes.

The political activity index consists of eight items. The respondent was asked if he talked about the election with anyone, tried to influence another's vote choice, attended any political gatherings, worked for any candidate or party, wore a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on the car, or gave money to a candidate or party. In addition to these campaign-specific items, the respondent was asked if he had written a letter to a public official about an opinion or something that should be done, or if he had written a letter to a newspaper or magazine editor giving political opinions. The political activity score is the number of these activites engaged in.

The efficacy index consists of five items. Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed that they don't have a say in government, that voting is the only way they have any say in how the government runs things, that government is too complicated to understand what is going on, that public officials don't really care what people like the respondent think, and that people elected to congress quickly lose touch with the people. The maximally efficacious person in this study would disagree with all of the above, indicating that he feels he has a say in, and understands, government, and that elected officials are responsive and care about what people think. The more items disagreed with the higher the efficacy score, on a count from zero to five. Both of the dependent measures were standardized to assure comparability across tables.

The television exposure measure is the average of three four-point scales. The respondent was asked to indicate frequency of viewing national and local news, on a four-point scale ranging from "never" to "frequently" and programs about the campaign -- "a good many," "several," "just one or

two," or none.

Newspaper exposure is the average of four four-point scales, ranging from "frequently" to "never," indicating frequency of reading about national and local politics, international affairs, and about the election. Both newspaper and television exposure indices, then, contain questions about on going media activity, as well as, an election-year specific item. Both exposure measures were scored such that zero means no media exposure and three means frequent media exposure.

Media reliance was based on a single item: "Which do you rely on most for information about politics -- newspapers or television?" In the analysis, reliance was treated as two dummy variables: television reliance scored one if television was the preferred medium, zero otherwise; and newspaper reliance scored one if newspapers was the preferred medium, zero otherwise. Consistent with the requirements of dummy coding, individuals who did not express a preference for one medium over the other were scored zero for both television and newspaper reliance.

In addition, three control variables which have been found to be associated with the above measures were used in the analysis. They are: age in years, years of education, and family income in thousands of dollars.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Zero order correlations among the above measures are reported in Table One. As expected, the two dependent variables, political activity and political efficacy, are positively correlated.

Among the media variable, newspaper and television news exposure are positively correlated indicating that individuals who attend public affairs information on one medium tend to do so on the other. While this modest

correlation does not preclude the possibility that some individuals attend one medium to the exclusion of other media, this does not appear to be the general case. Rather, it appears that individuals tend to follow public affairs or not irrespective of medium. The strong negative correlation between the reliance measure is an artifact of the coding scheme used. Each reliance measure correlates positively with exposure to the preferred medium and negatively with the alternative medium. This pattern indicates that reliance and exposure are distinct constructs. Apparently exposure is indicative of general interest in public affairs while reliance is indicative of discrimination in exposure to alternative media.

The pattern of correlations between the media variables and the dependent variables is generally congruent with past research. Political activity and efficacy are positively correlated with newspaper and television exposure (as reported by Miller et al.) and with newspaper dependency. However, television reliance is negatively associated with the dependent variables (as reported by Robinson).

The control variables -- age, education and income -- are positively related to the dependent variables and to newspaper exposure, television exposure, and newspaper reliance. They are however, negatively related to television reliance. Education and income are positively related to one another, but negatively related to age.

Before proceeding to multivariate analysis, it was deemed essential to control for age, education, and income to guard against inferring spurious relationships. This was achieved by regressing each dependent variable (political activity and efficacy) on the set of control variables, calculating the predicted value of each dependent variable for each case, and subtracting the predicted value from the observed

value.

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the effects of the media variables on political activity and political efficacy. To examine interactions, cross products of each pair of media variables were used as predictor variables. The analysis proceeds in a hierarchical fashion, with main effects entered on the first step and product terms on the second step. If addition of the product terms produces a significant increment to R^2, interaction effects are inferred. These techniques are described by Cohen and Cohen (1975), Allison (1977), and Southwood (1978).

The results of the regression analysis are shown in Table Two. For both political efficacy and political activity the increments to R^2 from step one to step two are significant, mitigating against interpretation of step one. The significant increment means that the variables interact in their prediction of the dependent variables. That is, the effects of independent variables are different at different levels of other dependent variables.

Because of the presence of significant interactions, the coefficients presented in Table Two are rather obscure. However, with some algebraic manipulation, clear patterns emerge. We begin with the original regression equation:

(1) $y=B_1x_1+B_2x_2+B_3x_3+B_4x_4+B_5x_1x_2+B_6x_1x_3+B_7x_1x_4+B_8x_2x_3+B_9x_2x_4$

where the x's represent the variables as indicated in Table One, and the B's represent ordinary standardized regression coefficients in Table Two. Equation one may be written:

(2) $y=(B_1+B_5x_2+B_6x_3+B_7x_4)x_1+B_2x_2+B_3x_3+B_4x_4+B_8x_2x_3+B_9x_2x_4$

or alternatively,

(3) $y=(B_2+B_5x_1+B_8x_3+B_9x_4)x_2+B_1x_1+B_3x_3+B_4x_4+B_5x_1x_2+B_6x_1x_3$

The terms in parentheses in the above equations are variable slopes that are functions of the x's in parentheses. The terms outside the parentheses are variable intercepts, or origins. Thus, the terms inside parentheses in Equation two constitute the variable slope of the y's on newspaper exposure and the terms outside parentheses are the variable origin. Equation Three shows the slope and origin for television exposure. (It should be noted that Equations One, Two, and Three are mathematically identical and other rearrangements are possible. Equations Two and Three are chosen for clear, although redundant, presentation.)

By substituting appropriate values in Equations Two and Three, slopes and origins of newspaper exposure and television exposure may be calculated. The appropriate values for the reliance variable are zero and one, since these are by definition the only values they can assume. Thus, when zero is substituted for both x_3 (newspaper reliance) and x_4 (television reliance) the resulting coefficients derived from the equations are for the non-reliant group of individuals -- that is, those not indicating a preference for either medium. When x_3 is one and x_4 is zero, resulting coefficients are for the newspaper reliant group. When x_3 is zero and x_4 is one, resulting coefficients are for the television reliant group. The exposure variables take on a range of values continuously from zero to three. Following the suggestion of Cohen and Cohen (1975), values for each variable one standard deviation above and below its mean were chosen to represent high and low levels of newspaper and television exposure.

By substituting all possible combinations of these values into Equations Two and Three, the coefficients shown in Table Three were derived. Examining Table Three, one can see, for example, that among

non-reliant individuals, the slope of political efficacy on newspaper exposure is .05 when television exposure is low (one standard deviation below the mean of television exposure) and .12 when television exposure is high (one standard deviation above the mean). Examination of the pattern of slopes of political efficacy on newspaper exposure in Table Three clearly indicates that (1) the slopes are positive except in the television reliant/low newspaper exposure condition, (2) television exposure generally enhances the effects of newspaper exposure, and (3) the effects are highest among the newspaper reliant and lowest among the television reliant.

Examination of the slopes of political efficacy on television exposure reveals that (1) the slopes are negative in the non-reliant and newspaper reliant groups and positive in the television reliant group, and (2) newspaper exposure generally makes the slope of television exposure more positive. A similar pattern of results emerges when political activity is taken as the dependent variable (shown in Table Four).

The origins shown in Tables Three and Four also very markedly; however, rather than attempt a direct interpretation of them, it is best to extend the substitution procedures. This is done by substituting values one standard deviation above and below the mean for the equations shown in Tables Three and Four. For example, the slope of television exposure in the non-reliant/low television exposure group with political efficacy is .05, and the origin is .07.

The results of this procedure for political efficacy are shown in Table Five, and for political activity in Table Six. It should be stressed that the cell means presented are hypothetical in the sense that

they represent the estimated mean of individuals under the conditions described rather than the observed means of a group. The results, however, are empirically derived.

Examining the hypothetical cell means for political efficacy in Table Five reveals that (1) means are consistently higher in the high newspaper exposure cells, (2) differences among the different exposure conditions are more extreme in the newspaper-reliant cells, (3) for the non-reliant and the newspaper-reliant group, the highest efficacy occurs in the low television exposure/high newspaper exposure cells, but in the television reliant group, the highest cell is the high television exposure/high newspaper exposure cell.

As is shown in Table Six, a somewhat different pattern emerges when political activity is the dependent variable: (1) cells are consistently highest when exposure to both media is high, (2) cells are lowest when newspaper exposure is low and television exposure is high in the non-reliant/newspaper reliant cells and when exposure to both media is low in the television reliant cells, and (3) differences are most extreme in the newspaper among reliant cells.

In general, the pattern of results shows that newspaper exposure is positively related to political efficacy and activity regardless of reliance group, and that the most positive results are in the newspaper reliant group. Television exposure is negatively related to the dependent variables in the non-reliant/newspaper reliant groups, but is positively related in the television reliant group.

Television exposure does not have a consistent negative relationship to efficacy and activity, as suggested by Robinson, nor does it have a

consistent, but slight positive relationship as suggested by Miller et al.

The Miller et al. finding could be attributed to the fact that the majority of the sample (51 percent) is television reliant and that the relationship of television exposure is positive for this group. Thus, when television effects are averaged across the sample for this group, a slight positive relationship between television exposure and the dependent variables emerges, despite the fact that there is a negative relationship in a minority of the sample.

The Robinson findings might be attributed to the fact that the correlation between television exposure and television reliance is relatively slight (.12 in this sample). Thus, there may be substantial numbers of individuals who call themselves television reliant, but do not watch sufficient news on television to reach relatively high levels of efficacy and activity.

The finding that effects of newspaper exposure are highest in the newspaper reliant group and the effects of television exposure are positive in the television reliant group indicates that reliance is indeed a valid measure of something other than simple exposure. It appears that when individuals indicate that they rely upon a specific medium, they are better able to extract political information through exposure to that medium than through exposure to the alternative medium. Newspaper reliant individuals enhance their efficacy and activity through newspaper exposure and television reliant individuals enhance their efficacy and activity through television news exposure.

The shift in the direction of effects of television exposure between the non-reliant/newspaper-reliant and the television-reliant suggests that the negative qualities attributed to television news intrude on

the efficacy and activity of non-reliant/newspaper reliant individuals, but do not intrude for television reliant individuals.

The strong negative effects of television exposure on political activity when newspaper exposure is high in the non-reliant/newspaper reliant groups suggests a variant of Lazarsfeld and Mertons "narcotizing" hypothesis. For these groups, newspaper exposure may motivate political activity, but vicarious participation through television exposure gratifies this motivation.

DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis of the effects of reliance and exposure support the strategy of examining them as distinct though related constructs. The differences in the dependent variable among the different exposure conditions, within reliance groups show that levels of activity and efficacy are related, not only to the level of exposure to the preferred medium, but also to the level of exposure to the other medium.

To an extent, then, it would appear that splitting people into groups based only on what medium they rely on is artifical, and presents an unrealistic forced-choice alternative to respondents. In spite of the fact that one medium may be preferred, or relied on, it would be reasonable to expect that exposure to other media does take place. In addition varying degrees of exposure to the preferred medium obviously occur.

The very word "reliance" must involve a variety of connotations to different people. For instance, one might report relying on television for news because he believes it to be more credible than newspapers, and likes the almost instantaneous ability of the medium to convey information about events. However, the same person might not take the time to watch

television news on a consistent basis -- thus, not exposing himself to the medium. By the same token, a person might report relying on newspapers because of a perceived social desirability of educated people shunning television and reading more in-depth accounts of events found in newspapers -- but because of time constraints, for instance, that person might neglect his preferred medium and make more use of television for the sake of convenience.

Consequently, as a self-report measure, reliance may have an affective component in addition to reflecting actual behavior. Exposure, on the other hand, may be thought of as a clearer indication of what media activity actually takes place. Combining the two, into an index for example, must necessarily mask their relative contributions to the dependent variables. What's more, treating the two separately more accurately reflects reality, because it allows establishing conditions that include varying degrees of exposure to television and newspapers, as well as an overlying effect of being reliant on a medium.

Because of the political implications of lowered political activity and efficacy in the electorate, researchers will no doubt find it important to continue to try to determine what effects, if any, media have on political affects and behavior. One major question remaining, then, is do media have direct effects on people because they are exposed to them, or do people with existing affects and levels of behavior engage in the media behavior that best complements their predispositions? (Do people that do not have the time or inclination to participate in politics also watch television because it requires less time and active participation on the viewer's part?)

Miller et al. have demonstrated the utility of using panel data to examine causal relationships. After associations have been demonstrated in studies like this one, the Miller et al. approach would appear to be useful to further disentangle the complex relationships involved.

Aside from establishing causal paths, it appears that research is needed to examine further the antecedents of reliance. As demonstrated in this study, reliance and exposure do not have across the board effects on all groups. Different processes appear to be taking place among the different reliance groups. The question could be asked: does reliance on a given medium reflect a different approach to that medium than to another, causing an individual to process information from different media in different ways and with different effects? Research designed to answer this question could lead to a fuller understanding of how an affect conditions the results of a behavior. That is, how does reliance on a medium condition and influence the ways in which information from that medium and other media is processed?

Footnote

1. The data used in this paper were gathered by the Center for Political Studies, and made available by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, the University of Michigan. The authors bear responsibility for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

References

ALLISON, P. (1977) "Testing for Interaction in Multiple Regression." American Journal of Sociology 83(1):144-153.

BECKER, L. and J. FRUIT (1979) "Television and the Origins of Proposition 13: Did the Nightly News Make the Tax Revolt Inevitable?" Unpublished report prepared for presentation to the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Buck Hill Falls, Pa.

BECKER, L. and D.C. WHITNEY (1980) "Effects of Media Dependencies: Audience Assessment of Government." Communication Research 7:95-121.

BLUMLER, J. and D. McQUAIL (1969) Television in Politics: Its Uses and Influences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CLARKE, P. and E. FREDIN (1978) "Newspapers, Television and Political Reasoning." Public Opinion Quarterly 42:143-160.

COHEN, J. and P. COHEN (1975) Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

DeFLEUR, M. AND S. BALL-ROKEACH (1975) Theories of Mass Communication, New York: David McKay.

LANG, K. and E. LANG (1959) "The Mass Media and Voting," in E. Burdick and A. Brodbeck, (eds.) American Voting Behavior. New York: Free Press.

LAZARSFELD, P.F. and R.K. MERTON (1971) "Mass Communication, Popular Taste, and Organized Social Action," in Wilbur Schramm and Donald F. Roberts (eds.) The Process and Effects of Mass Communication.

MANHEIM, J.B. (1976) "Can Democracy Survive Television?" Journal of Communication 26:87.

MILLER, A.H. (1974) "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1964-1970." American Political Science Review 68:951-972.

MILLER, A., L. EBRING and E. GOLDENBERG (1976) "Type-set Politics: Impact of Newspapers on Issue Salience and Public Confidence." Prepared for delivery at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

O'KEEFE, G.J. (1980) "Political Malaise and Reliance on Media." Journalism Quarterly

PATTERSON, T.E. and R.D. McCLURE (1976) The Unseeing Eye. New York: Putnam.

ROBINSON, M.J. (1975) "American Political Legitimacy in an Era of Electronic Journalism: Reflections on the Evening News." In Douglas Cater and Richard Adler, eds. Television as a Cultural Force: New Approaches to TV Criticism (New York: Praeger)

ROBINSON, M.J. (1976) "Public Affairs Television and the Growth of Political Malise: The Case of 'The Selling of the Pentagon'." American Political Science Review 70:409-432.

References

ROBINSON, M.J. (1977) "Television and American Politics: 1956-1976." Public Interest 48:3-39.

ROBINSON, M.J. and C. ZUKIN, "Television and the Wallace Vote." Journal of Communication 26:79-83.

ROPER ORGANIZATION (1977) Changing Public Attitudes toward Television and Other Mass Media 1959-76. New York: Television Information Office.

ROSENBERG, M. (1954) "Some Determinants of Political Apathy." Public Opinion Quarterly 18:349-366.

SOUTHWOOD, K. (1978) "Substantive Theory and Statistical Interaction: Five Models." American Journal of Sociology 83(5):1154-1202.

WADE, S. and W. SCHRAMM (1969) "The Mass Media as Sources of Public Affairs, Science and Health Knowledge." Public Opinion Quarterly 33: 197-209.

TABLE ONE

Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, and Reliabilities

	Y_1	Y_2	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_5	X_6
Activity Y_1	--							
Efficacy Y_2	.28	--						
Newspaper X_1 Exposure	.48	.29	--					
Television X_2 Exposure	.27	.10	.43	--				
Newspaper X_3 Reliance	.14	.13	.25	-.16	--			
Television X_4 Reliance	-.15	-.14	-.33	.12	-.61	--		
Education X_5	.38	.34	.44	.10	.17	-.16	--	
Age X_6	-.09	-.08	.05	.18	.01	-.09	-.40	--
Income X_7	.32	.23	.34	.10	.17	-.17	.45	-.25
Mean	-2.04	-2.03	1.65	2.05	1.19	.619	44.92	11.04
Standard Deviation	1.34	1.13	.93	.79	.389	.485	18.21	5.83
Reliability (alpha)	.59	.66	.79	.54	NA	NA	NA	NA

TABLE TWO

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

	Efficacy		Activity	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Newspaper Exposure X_1	.10**	.08	.20**	.28**
Television Exposure X_2	-.01	-.07	.06**	-.03
Newspaper Reliance X_3	.05	-.09	.07**	.02
Television Reliance X_4	.01	-.08	.07**	.10
$X_1 X_2$		.03		.05
$X_1 X_3$		.21**		.06
$X_1 X_4$		-.05		-.20**
$X_2 X_3$		-.06		-.02
$X_2 X_4$		.15		.17
R^2	.01*	.02*	.05**	.06*
Increment to R^2	.01*	.01*	.05**	.01*

*p.<.05
**p.<.01

TABLE THREE

Political Efficacy: Standardized Slopes and Origins of Media Exposure in Differing Reliance Groups

	Newspaper Reliant		Non-Reliant		Television Reliant	
Television Exposure	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Newspaper Exposure						
Origin	.04	-.23	.07	-.07	-.16	.01
Slope	.27	.33	.05	.12	-.01	.06
Newspaper Exposure	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Television Exposure						
Origin	-.40	.20	-.09	.09	-.10	-.05
Slope	-.16	-.10	-.10	-.03	.05	.12

TABLE FOUR

Political Activity: Standardized Slopes and Origins of Media Exposure in Differing Reliance Groups

	Newspaper Reliant		Non-Reliant		Television Reliant	
Television Exposure	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Newspaper Exposure						
Origin	.06	-.01	.03	-.03	-.04	.24
Slope	.29	.39	.23	.33	.03	.13
Newspaper Exposure	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Television Exposure						
Origin	-.33	.36	-.28	.28	.02	.19
Slope	-.10	.00	-.08	.02	.09	.19

TABLE FIVE

Political Efficacy: Hypothetical Cell Means, Levels of Exposure by Differing Reliance Groups

		Newspaper Reliant		Non-Reliant		Television Reliant	
Television Exposure		Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Newspaper Exposure	Low	-.23	-.56	.01	-.19	-.16	-.05
	High	.30	.11	.12	.05	-.17	.07

TABLE SIX

Political Activity: Hypothetical Cell Means, Levels of Exposure by Differing Reliance Groups

		Newspaper Reliant		Non-Reliant		Television Reliant	
Television Exposure		Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
Newspaper Exposure	Low	-.23	-.42	-.20	-.36	-.07	.11
	High	.35	.36	.26	.30	-.01	.38